

REMARKS

Examiner Interview

Initially, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended Applicants' representative in a personal interview in the Examiner's offices on March 12, 2003. The amendments and remarks herein are consistent with the discussion during that interview. A copy of the Interview Summary Record from the interview is enclosed for the Examiner's reference.

Amendments to the Claims

Applicants have amended the claims to clarify further the subject matter that Applicants regard as the invention. In particular, Applicants have amended Claim 33 to recite "a trench having a width of no more than about 0.18 μm and a depth of greater than about 10 μm ." Support for this language can be found in, *e.g.*, the Application, p. 13, lines 9-18, as originally filed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments add no new matter and are fully supported by the Application as originally filed.

Newly Added Claim

Applicants have added Claim 38. Support for Claim 38 can be found in, *e.g.*, the Application, p. 13, as originally filed. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that the added claim adds no new matter and is fully supported by the Application as originally filed.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 33-37 as being unpatentable over Vo (U.S. Patent No. 5,097,381A) in view of Mazuréet et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,677,219). The Examiner stated that "Vo discloses an integrated capacitor formed in a trench having a width of no more than about 0.25 micrometers, a depth of greater than about 7 micrometers and an aspect ratio greater than about 20:1 (see column 5, lines 35-45) ..."

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims, as amended herewith, are patentably distinct.

Applicants note that Claim 33 has been amended to recite "a trench having a width of no more than about 0.18 μm and a depth of greater than about 10 μm ." Applicants submit that Vo does not teach such a combination of a relatively narrow "trench" "width of no more than about 0.18 μm " and a relatively high "trench" "depth of greater than about 10 μm ." Rather, Applicants believe that it is Applicants who have disclosed how to form the claimed capacitor in such narrow and deep "trench[es]" and that such capacitors represented particular challenges for prior art methods. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Vo and Mazur  t et al. does not teach all the limitations of amended independent Claim 33. As such, Applicants submit that Claim 33 is non-obvious in view of the art of record.

Additionally, Applicants note that newly added Claim 38 recites, *inter alia*, "an aspect ratio of about 40:1", as discussed during the interview with the Examiner. Applicants submit that the art of record also does not disclose such a capacitor.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the pending claims are allowable over the art of record. Applicants have not addressed the further rejections of dependent claims as being moot in view of the amendments and remarks herein. However, Applicants expressly do not acquiesce in the Examiner's findings not addressed herein. Indeed, Applicants submit that the dependent claims recite further non-obvious features of particular utility.

Appl. No. : 09/764,711
Filed : January 18, 2001

CONCLUSIONS

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants request entry of the amendments and submit that the application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request the same. If some issue remains which the Examiner feels may be addressed by Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is cordially invited to call the undersigned for authorization.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: May 8, 2003

By: Adeel S. Akhtar
Adeel S. Akhtar
Registration No. 41,394
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(415) 954-4114

W:\DOCS\ZYWZYW-1679.DOC
050203